## Notice of Breach of Privilege

† ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ನಾನು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಸಂಬ್ಧೆ ೧೭೭ರ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಒಂದು ನೋಟೀಸನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ ಇದೆ. ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ೩ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಮೇಲ್ಮನೆಯ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಎಮ್. ಖೇಣಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಆರ್. ಎಸ್. ಮನೋಹರ್ ಅವರುಗಳು ಬೇಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಿಂದ ನನ್ನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಏನು ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಇದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿ. ಆರೋಪಣೆ ಮತ್ತು ಧೂಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ. I have carefully gone through many cases and also the Rules relating to it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ನಾನು ಯಾರನ್ನೂ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಬೇಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಉದ್ರೇಕಗೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ನಾನು ಉದ್ರೇಕಗೊಂಡು ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ದೂರವಾದ ಹಾಗೂ ಬೇರೊಬ್ಬರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಪಮಾನಕರವಾದ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ೨೧-೨-೮೦ ರಂದು ಭಾಲ್ಕಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ರೈತ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನ ನಡೆಯಿತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉದ್ಘಾಟನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಸುಮಾರು ೨ ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿದ್ದರು. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಮೂಲೆ ಮೂಲೆಯಿಂದ ರೈತರು ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು; ಕೆಲವರು ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಸುಮಾರು ೩-೪ ಸಾವಿರ ಜನ ಎತ್ತಿನ ಗಾಡಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಕೆಲವರು ಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟರ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಜನ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಅಂತಹ ಲಾರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಶ್ರೀ ವೀರಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಎಂಬುವರ ಲಾರಿಯು ಆಕ್ಸಲ್ ಮುರಿದು ಬಿಟ್ಟದ್ದರಿಂದ ೧೦-೧೫ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಣ್ಣಪುಟ್ಟ ಗಾಯಗಳಾದವು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಚಿಕಿತ್ಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಇನ್ನೇನು ಹಾನಿಯಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಲಾರಿ ಮಾನಾರಾಳ್ಳಿಯಿಂದ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಡ್ರೈವರ್ ಅದನ್ನು ಸೈಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವಾಗ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಿ ಲಾರಿ ಕೆಳಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿದ್ದದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಮುದುಕರು ಸತ್ತು ಹೋದರು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ೬೫-೭೦ ವರ್ಷ ವಯಸ್ಸಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೂ ಅದು ದುಃಖದ ಮಾತು. ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಆದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಳವಳ ಇದೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪರಿಹಾರವಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸುರವರು ೪ ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ ನಾನು ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೃತಜ್ಞನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದು ಇದ್ದಂತಹ ವಿಚಾರ. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದು ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ದೂರವಾದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಬೇಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. They have charged me stating that I have used the Government lorries to bring people for kissan rally. And also the trucks of the sugar factory are misused for bringing people to kissan rally. As Sugar Factory Chairman, I cannot misuse my power.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ತಾವು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ಸಿನಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರೋ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯದು. ಅವರು ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗೇ ಇಲ್ಲ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM —I rise to a point of order. Sir can we discuss anything which has been discussed in the Legislative Council

MR. SPEAKER.—He is submitting the facts before the House.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—I am asking whether this House could take cognisance of any matter that has been taken up and discussed in the Legislative Council.

MR. SPEAKER.— The Hon. Member Sri Khandre is making only preliminary submission. On that I will give a ruling.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—If whatever that is discussed in the egislative Council could be brought here, every time you have to permit us.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member Sri Khandre has given a notice under rule 177 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in this House. I have examined and given him permission to make preliminary submission. I will give a ruling afterwards as to whether it could be proceeded with or not.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮೈಬೇಲ್ ಬಿ. ಪೆರ್ನಾಂಡೀಸ್.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಏಂಡ್ರೆಯವರು ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟ್ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರೇ ಜಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವಂತಹ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರು ಹೇಳುವುದೇ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟ್ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಹೇಗೆ ನಂಬುವುದು ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಈಗ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟ್ಸ್ನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

MR. SPEAKER.—You please refer to the rule 177/ I know, that no speech made in the Council shall be referred to in this House. But, on a request being made by him in advance, I have given permission to quote the reference of the proceedings of the Legisative Council.

† SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I would like to intervene at this stage. In the last Assembly, there was a statement made by me in this House against Sri Shame Gowda. And Shri Shame Gowda, an ex-M.L.C. raised an objection against me. That was not allowed. Therefore, Sri Khandre cannot raise any point which has been discussed there. The hon. Member against whom this privilege motion is being raised is not here to defend himself. Therefore, what I said in the Legislative Council cannot be discussed here. There should be definite and clear cut yardstick in these matters. because this is going to be a precedent Moreover, the hon. Member Sri Khandre is defending what has been actually said in the Legislative Council regarding the incident. I do not know under what provision of rule you have given permission to raise this matter. But, there should be a definite norm in this matter. The hon. Member is speaking of misuse of lorry etc. The very member is using the Government building which was constructed for Government High School purpose, whereas the Government High School is being run in a rented building. He has been using that Government building since a very long time. Such being the case, it shows the sincerity and honesty of the hon. member Sri Khandre. As Chairman of the Sugar Factory he himself is denying that fact and now having used the lorries of that Sugar factory, he is saying that he has not used those lorries.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am not aware of all these facts. I would like to say that the hon. Member Sri Khandre has given a notice under rule 177 and I have fully examined this case. There are several rulings in this regard given in the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha. please wait

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—Why should we wait? Let the hon. Member Sri Khandre go to the Council and defend himself. Why should we waste our time like this?

† SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Now, the hon. Member Sri Khandre has given notice under rule 177. And it is a question of privilege. The Hon. Speaker has pleased to say that he has permitted the hon. Member to make a preliminary submission, which, in other words, granting of permission to speak in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have not given consent...

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—The preliminary submission, is now being made on the floor of the House and in accordance with what the hon. Speaker just now mentioned under rule 290, a statement of fact or policy of Minister could be quoted. The Hon. Speaker is pleased to say that the hon. Member is only making a submission of certain facts. Here comes the rub. Supposing according to the hon. Member what he seems to say, if that is not a statement of fact, what will be the position?

MR. SPEAKER.—I will give a ruling afterwards.

SRI D DEVARAJ URS.—There is one more point, if that is the situation, can the privilege motion arising out of discussion or speech made on the floor of the other House, be discussed in this matter? That is very very important.

3-00 P.M.

Rule 290 reads like this:

> "No speech made in the Council shall be quoted in the Assembly unless it is a definite statement of policy by a Minister"

Now who made that statement in the Council? Is it a Minister or a member? I want to know whether the statement made on the floor of the Council is that of a Minister or a member? Therefore, I request the hon. Chair to please let me know whether the question raised by the hon. Member under Rule 177 is with reference to a speech or a policy speech made by the Minister. A Minister cannot be equated

with that of a member here. Here Rule 290 specifically mentions about the Minister's statement. It is not a speech of a member. That too it further says :

> "Provided that the Speaker may on a request being made to him in advance give permission to a member to quote a speech or make reference to the proceedings in the Council if the Speaker thinks that such a course is necessary in order to enable the member to develop a point of privilege or procedure"

This is not the privilege arising out of the statement of a Minister made in the Council. Now what will happens? This is no more a statement made by the Minister. If it is not a Minister it must be a Member. He might have said certain things which the hon. Member felt not as a statement of facts. I will not come to that stage now. If the hon. Member thinks that these are not the facts. He has got many occasion wherein he could refer to it. In this connection, I too sent a call attention notice regarding the Chief Minister's visit to Bidar and about 'Thulabhara' etc., The Government has got the advantage to tell the House what exactly happened there. I am not questioning your wisdom or any such other things. But at least you willagree with me that I have got every right to express my views. In my opinion, this is not the proper forum for such things.

Because this will become a precedent again. If we read Rule 290 it merely refers to the statement of a Minister. If the Hon. Speaker thinks that such a course is necessary in order to enable the member to develop a point of privilege or procedure etc., let us know. Now if it is extended to any Member, any member in this House can go on quoting the speeches made in the other House and similarly the discussion of this House could be discussed in the Upper House also. Therefore, I am afraid, this will give scope for lot of misconceptions as well as lot of misunderstandings and confusions in this House. After one stage the Council people may start speaking on what we speak here, leading to difficult situations. Therefore, I would rather submit, I have no objection for the hon. Members expression nor do am I preventing him from making his speech. Perhaps he has to think of a different remedy for this. If it is given under the privilege, I am affraid it will lead to lot of difficulties.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು. — 290ನೇ ವಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನಾಗಿ ಹಿಂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿಧಾನಪರಿಷತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಯಾವ ಭಾಷಣವೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಅದು ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರ ಸರಕಾರದ ಕಾರ್ಯನೀತಿಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ನಿರ್ಧಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಾಗಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಕೂಡದು .. ಆದಾಗ್ಯೂ ವಿಧಾನಪರಿಷತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಬಂದು ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ವಿಧಾನಪರಿಷತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಪಕ್ಕಿಗಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಸಭೆಯ

ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನಕ್ಕಾಗಲಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ವಿವರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನೀಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಭಾವಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ತಮಗೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಕೋರಿಕೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದಾಗ ಆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಂಥ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಇದೆ.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—It refers to a Minister but not a Member. To make a reference or quote a speech or make reference to the proceedings in the Council is not here. It is specifically mentioned here. It is only with reference to the speech of a Minister. The proviso governs that.

SRI A. LAXMI SAGAR —Sir, my submission is this. The entire rule must be read together. It is well known that rule of interpretation includes rules also.

There is no mention to a member's speech in the other House. Sir, my first submission is that both main rule and proviso must be read together. So, the main rule refers about a statement of policy made in the other house to which a reference can be made in this House also. There is no doubt about it. It refers to a policy statement made by a Minister. It is a matter which it within the competency of this House to refer to it. But there can't be two policy statements by a Minister one in the other House and another in this House. Therefore, policy statement if there is any, reference could be made. This is point No. 1. Now, Sir, with your permission I will read rule 290 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Legislative Assembly. It reads;

> "290. No speech made in the Council shall be quoted in the Assembly unless it is a definite statement of policy by a Minister.
>
> Provided that the Speaker may on a request being made to him in advance give permission to a member to quote a speech or make reference to the proceedings in the Council if the Speaker thinks that such a course is necessary in order to enable the member to develop a point of privilege or procedure".

Therefore, Sir, by no stretch of imagination we can infer the expression 'member' is different from one which has been raised in this House without having any reference to the policy statement of a Minister. If this is accepted I think my friend Mr. Bhimanna Khandre cannot raise this issue. Therefore he will have to use some other forum to raise this issue and refer the subject that is before us. He cannot ventilate his grievances and make use of this House as the forum to submit them.

Sir, my next and last submission is if a member wishes to raise the subject matter relating to conduct of another Member he can do so by raising that issue in some other forum and not in this House. He cannot ventilate his grievances and seek remedy at the hands of your goodself. That is not permissible.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—Sir, I hope you will agree with me. It is a well known proverb–two advocates do not agree with each other on a point. You are also an Advocate. I think you will agree with me. Sir, I would like to read rule 289. It reads;

> "289. No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of reply:

This does not arise.

> Provided that the Speaker may at any time prohibit any member from making any such allegation if he is of opinion that such allegation is derogatory to the dignity of the Assembly or that no public interest is served by making such allegation.

This also does not arise.
What arises is "No Speech made in the Council shall be quoted in the Assembly unless it is a definite statement of policy by a Minister' We do not anticipate any policy statement to be made by a Minister in the other House.

AN HON. MEMBER.—Sir, the Hon. Member is deviating the subject...

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I am not deviating the subject. I know every minute of this Assembly costs the exchequer very heavily. I do not want to waste time by bringing unimportant matters in this House' My submission to the Hon'ble Speakar is that the Chair should not take the convenience of English translation into Kannada. Of course, I do not know Kannada. I have not learnt Kannada, but I can speak and understand. Even in Marathi Schools your Government was not able to declare Kannada as 'Compulsory Subject". I can speak Kannada. I cannot write Kannada. I can even make a budget speech. So, don't quote the Kannada translation. I request and appeal to the Secretariat of the Legislature to correct the Kannada translation of the Rules properly.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—Sir, I have just heard the interpretation of rule 290 made by Sri Lakshmi Sagar and also the Leader of the Opposition and our friend Sri Azeez Sait. He made some attempt to intepret the translation of the rule. Now, the substantive matter dealt with by rule 290 is about the speech made in the Ligislative Council.

Rule 290 is a specific rule which imposes a restriction in quoting speeches made in the Council. Ministers alone can make a policy stetement and not any member of the House. This rule does not mention whatsoever about the limitation of a speech made by a Minister. The general rule laid down under rule 290 is with regard to the restriction in quoting speeches made in the Council. It lays down that no speech made in the Council shall be quoted in the Assembly unless it is a definite statement of policy by a Minister. Every rule has an exception. Here the proviso makes an exception. And what is the exception ? The exception is that the Speaker may on a request made to him in advance give permission to a member to quote a speech made in the Council. So, firstly a request will have to be made to the Speaker in advance by a member and secondly, the Speaker will have to give permission to that member and while giving permission, the Speaker will have to satisfy himself that such a course is necessary in order to enable the member to develop a point of privilege. The exception is provided for in the proviso to enable a member to develop a point of privilege. Once this exception is availed of them the Hon. Member will have to go back to rule 177 to move a privilege motion. I am not speaking on the merits of the case. I do not know whether the hon. member has complied with the ingredients as provided in rule 290. If he has complied with rule 290, it need not be a matter with reference to a policy statement made by the Minister, He can independently avail of the proviso after taking the permission of the Speaker to quote a speech or make a reference to the proceedings in the Council.

† SRI HARNAHALLI RAMASWAMY (Gandasi).—Sir, to some extent I agree with the Hon. Minister for Finance, Mr Veerappa Moily. The most important question is whether the motion falls whitin the purview of Rule 177. Now the matter appears to be concerning an incident happened outside of both the Houses. It concerns with the behaviour of certain individuals not in the capacity of a Legislator or a member of this House. It is something outside the purview of this House and even outside the duty or functions of a particular member.

Now, first of all we have to see whether there is any prima facie involing a Breach of privilege either of a Member, or of the Assembly or of a Committee thereof From what has been said by the Hon.

Member it reveals that there is absolutely no base for entertaining any idea about the privilege involved in this behalf. With great respect to the Chair I would submit that it is a matter which the Speakar should not have even allowed the hon. member to make a submission about the matter being coming under the question of privilege. It is a private suit between the two individuals, For that purpose this House cannot be made use of as a forum to ventilate the personal grievances between the members as rightly pointed out by Sri. Veerappa Moily. Once he makes out a case then there is a question of privilege. Statement of a Minister on policy in the other House comes into the picture only as a reference. We cannot refer in to the proviso under rule 290 at all. As rightly pointed out by the Finance Minister it is only for the purpose of developing the issue of privilege and not for making out a case. Therefore, the first and most important point was, whether there is any semblance of privilege involved in this case. If the Speakar feels it is involved, I feel it will be a new precedent which would open floodgates and which will be a very dangerous proposition. Therefore, I would submit with great respect to the Chair to curtail the whole discussion at this stage and rule out the motion.

3-30 P.M.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I must say that the Hon. Minister should be complimented. He has argued very well. There is absolutely no case for privilege. Under Rule 290 this cannot be taken up unless Rule 177 is satisfied. This is the point. There is no case under Rule 177. This rule does not come into the picture at all. This is a statement made in the Upper House. The only thing that is allowed is, as all of us know, a member here can make a statement with the permission of the Hon. Speaker to clarify the position. It is not a motion under Rule 177. Therefore this matter cannot be brought here as a privilege motion. Every member has got a right to clarify matters. But how can you bring if as a privilege? That is why please do not allow this motion as a privilege nor allow this matter for preliminary discussion because it does not come as a privilege motion under Rule 177.

ಶ್ರೀ ಷೇರ್‌ಖಾನ್. –ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಸ್ಪೀಚ್ ಮಾಡಲು ತಾವು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ. ಅವರು ಸ್ಪೀಚ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದು ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೋ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಮಾಬುವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೋಡೋಣ.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I have been reminded of my old privilege motion. There was a motion moved against me as a member of the Assembly. Mr. Shair Khan is a very old Legislator. He was man-

handled at Gulbarga by his own party men. Why not he bring it here as privilege?

SRI SHEERNALI CHANDRASHEKAR.—Under Rule 290, the Hon. Speaker may or may not permit a privilege motion. He has got a right to allow the privilege motion on the floor of the House. Rule 290 reads as follows:

> "290. No speech made in the Council shall be quoted in the Assembly unless it is a definite statement of policy by a Minister:
>
> Provided that the Speaker may on a request being made to him in advance give permission to a member to quote a speech or make reference to the proceedings in the Council if the Speaker thinks that such a course is necessary in order to enable the member to develop a point of privilege or procedure".

You have been empowered to allow a member to raise a privilege motion. To raise a privilege motion he has to satisfy the rule 177 and 178 and 179. Rule 179 reads thus:

> "179: The right to raise a question of privilege shall be governed by the following conditions, namely:—
>
> (i) not more than one question shall be raised at the same sitting;
>
> (ii) the question shall be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence;
>
> (iii) the matter requires the intervention of the Assembly".

I draw your kind attention to sub clause 3 and it says the matter requires the intervention of the Assembly. If any man questions the right of a member, then only the privilege motion can be brought here. The question has come up with all seriousness. The member is really aggrieved.

[*Interruptions*]

SRI HARNAHALLI RAMASWAMY.—The question is whether the Member is aggrieved. This rule is to limit a member to raise anything on the floor of the House. That is the meaning of the rule mentioned by many members. Can he question in a Court of law the proceedings in the Council. What is the alternative? You have, to think it over To-day it has been referred to a particular member. To morrow samething may happen to X, Y, Z. But we have no other

course open we are helpless. My submission is the whole rule is to be amended. Otherwise, we cannot get anything. The member concerned can raise a motion under 177. I believe the Hon. Speaker has allowed him to move the motion. It is only at some stage the consent might have to be given. Under Rule 180, the proviso provides that the Speaker has got right to refuse his consent under Rule 177 or say that the matter supposed to be discussed is not in order The proviso reads as follows:

> "Provided that where the Speaker has refused his consent under Rule 177 or is of opinion that the matter proposed to be discussed is not in order, he may, if he thinks it necessary, read the notice of question of privilege and state that he refuses consent or holds that the notice of question of privilege is not in order".

It is only when the Speaker gives consent under rule 187 and

> "holds that the matter proposed to be discussed is in order, shall, after the questions and before the list of business is entered upon, call the member concerned, who shall rise in his place and while asking for leave to raise the question of privilege make a short statement relevant thereto".

Now if the Speaker were to allow him to raise a question and make a speech, it amounts to Speaker giving him permission to raise this as a privilege issue. Therefore, the only course open to the Hon. Speaker is to read out the motion and say that he does not allow it as a motion of privilege as it is not in order.

SRI B. B. SAYANAK..—Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. member has given notice under rule 177 regarding the privilege motion. According to the Leader of the Opposition and even the Minister, they have stated that there is no privilege motion. The scope of rule 290 is limited and it is stated that an discussion can be only on a statement of policy made by a Minister. Here the statement is not made by the Minister, some hon. member has made the statement. How are you going to give him permission to raise a privilege motion? If he wants to make any statement with the permission of the Chair under rule 293, that he is entitled to. I shall read out rule 293:

> '293: A member may, with the permission of the Speaker make a personal explanation although there is no question before the Assembly, but in this case no debatable matter may be brought forward, and no debate shall arise."

He can make his statement if he is hurt by the statement of any member in the Council, but he cannot raise it as a question of privilege. That is my submission.

SRI V. V. PATTAR.—The first part of the rule relates to the general rules Sir. A speech made in the Council can be quoted in the other House, that is a general rule. Unless it is a definit statement of a policy made by the Minister, no speech can be quoted here. That is the first restriction ; but second is an exception to the general rule.

"Provided that a Speaker may on a request being made to him in advance give permission to a member if insulting words are used in the other House."

If false allegations are made in the other House, then the member of this House has got a remedy under this particular rule. Therefore the Speaker is perfectly entitled to give permission to the member to make out a point regarding the development of privilege. However, the privilege motion is already given to the Speaker. So, Sri Bhimanna Khandre can speak about this matter in this House.

MR. SPEAKER.—If we refer to the Practice and Procedure in Parliament by Sri M. N. Kual and S. L. Shakdhar, it is said : "In cases where certain allegations were made in the other House against a member of Lok Sabha, the Speaker has permitted the affected member to make a personal explanation in the House to clarify his position."

So, Hon. member Sri Bhimanna Kandre should make a note of this. Sri Ramaswamy has pointed out rule 180 of the rules of Procedure in this House. That will be dealt with afterwards. Now as you are aware of the practice in this House, when such notices come up. the Speaker has permitted just to say what he wants to say In this case decision is not yet given. So, Sri Bhimanna Khandre has to stick to it and then I will give my ruling.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I agree with the quotation read out about the Practice and Procedure followed in Parliament. But under section 177–Privileges, the motion has to be referred to the Privileges Committee which the Speaker has not done and the Speaker is not competent to permit him to raise the privilege issue

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಪಯ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ನಾನು ತಪ್ಪಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಹೊರಗಡೆ ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, If any false allegation is made against a member, he can go to the Court as per section 503 of the Indian Penal Code.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು. –ಅದು ಓಪನಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು. ಅಲಿಗೇಷನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿ.

SRI BHIMANNA KHANDRE.—Raising the issue Sri N. M. Kheny said, "Kisan Rally was organised by Sri Bhimanna Khandre, Congress MLA who was the Chairman of the Co-operative Sugar Factory in Bidar. He has used the trucks of the Factory to convey men to the rally. He has also alleged that Sri Bhimanna Khandre has misused the bonus given to the workers. He has further said that Sri Khandre has commandeered the trucks, private buses and KSRTC buses. ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಏನು ಅಲಿಗೇಷನ್ಸ್ ಇವೆ. ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬೇಸ್‌ಲೆಸ್ ಇದೆ. ಇದಲ್ಲಾ ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ದೂರವಾದುದು. ಇವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಡಿನೈ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಆಫ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲ ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಡೆಫಮೇಟರಿ ಮತ್ತು ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿ ಅಪಮಾನಕರವಾದುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, If Executive Committee met at an emergent meeting under the Presidentship of.....and decided to clarify the position. There was absolutely no truth that trucks of factory were used to convey the workers to Kissan rally. There statement is false and far from truth. The Executive Committee further decided to condemn the false charge levelled. The pohtical decision has unnecesssarily dragged the workers and it has injured the dignity and honour of the President..."

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಮಜ್ದೂರ್ ಯೂನಿಯನ್‌ನ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಕೂಡ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಂಡೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಲೆಟರ್ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಆಲ್ಲಿಯ ಶುಗರ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಯು ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಸಹ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಖೇಣಿಯವರು ಬೂಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥದ್ದು ಆಪಾದನೆ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದು ನಿರಾಧಾರವೆಂದು ಈ ಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ಲಿಯರ್ ಆಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಮಗೆ ಎಂ. ಎನ್. ಕೌಲ್‌ರವರ ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟೀಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಕೋಡಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪೇಜ್ ೨೪೫ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರ ವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಆಗ ಇದು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬುದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಓದುವುದು ಬೇಡ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಗ ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಕೋಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಓದಿ ಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಆಗ ತಮಗೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೈಮಾಫೇಶಿ ಕೇಸ್ ಇದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಅಲೋ ಮಾಡಿ. ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.– ಬೇಡ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT. Sir, rightly or wrongly you allowed Sri Bheemanna Khandre to make a small statement. It has revealed certain very very important factors like use of Government vehicles, use of Sugar factory lorries, collection of money, etc. Without funds that Sammelan would not have been there. According to the hon. member the workers have not contributed. If so, from where the money came? If they were not Government vehicles or Sugar factory lorries, which lorries were used? I think the House is seized of the matter. To know whether the statement of hon. member of the other House Sri N. M. Kheni was correct or whether the statement of the hon. member Sri Bheemanna Khandre is correct, a small

Committee with Members of both the Houses, may be appointed to probe into the details and report to the House.

MR. SPEAKER.—I will dispose of this matter now.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT. -If a Committee is not going to be appointed, I will offer 'satyagraha' here.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪುದಸಲಾಲ್ ಬಂಡೆಪ್ಪ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆಯವರು ಯಾವುದೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ವಾಹನವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಮತ್ತು ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಯವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಂಥ ಬೋನಸ್ಸನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ಒಂದಲ್ಲ ೧೦ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮಾಡಿ. ಅವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸುಳ್ಳು ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳು, ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಮೇಲೆ ಸುಳ್ಳು ಆಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS —I wish to bring to the notice of this House onlyone point because hon. member Sri Bheemanna Khandre has denied certain matters Two points have come to my notice which are undeniable facts: the Government lorries have been used and Sugar factory lorries have been used to carry people to the Sammelan without proper permission of the Police and without licence. This has come to my notice.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೀರಪ್ಪ ಮೊಯ್ಲಿ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಇದು ನಾಳೆ ದಿವಸ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬರಬಹುದೆಂದು ನಾನು ನೆನೆಸಿದ್ದೆ ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಠ್‌ರವರು ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಆಬ್ಜೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾದರೂ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಉತ್ತಮ ಇದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಡಿಸ್ಕಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೊಂದು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್‌ಗೆ ಪ್ರೂಫ್ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿದರೆ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳುವಂಥಾದ್ದು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—That is all my point. When the hon. member has made a statement, whatever has come to my notice I must state.

SRI A. LAKSHMI SAGAR. —Sir, why is the Hon'ble Minister defending the conduct of the hon. member

4-00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER.—Shri Bheemanna Khandre has given notice of a Question of Privilege against Shri N. M. Kheny and Shri R. S. Manohar, Hon'ble Members of the Legislative Council for what he says, making untrue and defamatory allegations against Shri Khandre in the Legislative Council on 3-3-1980. Shri Khandre has enclosed the paper cuttings where th said allegations have been published. *Prima facie* the notice is not in order in that the member seeks to raise a Question of Privilege against two members of the Legislative Council for what they have spoken in the Legislative Council. Just as the Members of the Legislative Assembly have got Freedom of Speech in the House the Members of the Legislative

Council have also got Freedom of Speech in their House. One House cannot take action against another House, for what the members have spoken in the House. Further, from the notice of the member, it is seen that the attack on Mr. Bheemanna Khandre appears to be against him in his capacity as the Chairman of the Sugar Factory and not in his capacity as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. The concept of privilege is attached to a member in the discharge of the duties as a Member of the House, There is no reflection and no criticism of the member's duties in respect of the House. The following ruling of the Lok Sabha in this regard is pertinent.

"On the 6th June 1967, the Speaker informed the House that he had received notice of a question of privilege from Shri Sant Bux Singh, Dr Ramo Manohar Lohia and Shri Rabi Ray, members, on the following allegation made by Shri Sheel Bhandra Yajee, a member of Rajya Sabha, on the 30th May 1967, during the course of a debate in Rajya Sabha.

> "When the Report of the Vivian Bose Commission was being discussed, even though there were 750 Members of Parliament, Sahu Jain did not find a single member to lament, and Dr Ram Manohar Lohia had to take Rupees one lakh and on receiving that amount his Signatures were taken".

2. The Speaker (Dr N. Sanjeev Reddy) then observed.

> "Shri Sant Bux Singh gave me notice yesterday, we did discuss about it, I discussed it with Mr. Joshi and Mr .Rabi Ray also today. Looking to the rules and procedures not only in this Parliament but in other Parliaments also I feel that the other House being equally sovereign it is not proper for us to refer the matter to a Privilege Committee here, I would only say that it is unfortunate that members make allegations against the member of the other House–Rajya Sabha members saying against Lok Sabha members and Lok Sabha members saying against Rajya Sabha or-members make unsubstantiated allegations against each other in this House.
>
> Therefore, I am not allowing the privilege motions to be referred to the Committee of Privileges."

3. Again on the 23th June, 1967, Shri Madhu Limaye another member, sought to raise a question of privilege on the same allegation (para 1 above).

Shri Madhu Limaye contended that the allegation was untrue and had not been substantiated. This, he felt constituted a Breach of Privilege and contempt of the House and requested that matter be referred to the Chairman, Rajya Sabha, for appropriate action.

4. The Speaker, disallowing the question of privilege, ruled as follows.

"This matter was first raised by Shri Sant Bux Singh a fortnight ago and I thought I could convince him that the privilege of that House is as much sacrosant as the pri ilege of this House. Then, myself and Sri Fernandes discussed this matter in the Chamber a number of times. I tried to give as much chance as possible to members, either on the Congress side or on the Opposition to convince me or get themselves convinced by me about this point. As I said Shri Fernandes did discuss it with me wo or three times with the assistance of the Secretary and also of all groups here. The point now is, this House could take notice of it if the speech had been made as in the case of Shri Arjun Arora, outside the House. In the British Parliament also. the case to which Shri Limaye referred, a member of the House of Lords made the speech outside the House. Therefore, the Parliment could take note of it. Here the position is a little different. An hon. member of the Rajya Sabha made a speech on the floor of that House. The person against whom he made the allegations is an hon. member of this House. The point was raised by that House itself that it should be referred to the Privileges Committee. That House took notice of it. It is not as though they did not take notice of it at all. Then the Chairman said that he would look into the matter, he called the member who made the allegation, directed him to produce evidence and when that hon. member of the other House could not produce satisfactory evidence to the satisfaction of the Chairman, he said that there was absolutely nothing, the allegation was not proper

I disallow it because the Chairman has already given a decision and I do not want to refer it to the same Chairman to take it up again."

In the light of the background in the ruling of Lok Sabha, I withhold my consent to the question of privilege.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಡಿ. ದೇವೇಗೌಡ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಠರು ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ಬಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡ ತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆಯವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರೀ ಪ್ರೌಢಶಾಲಾ ಕಟ್ಟಡವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಆರೋಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಆಸ್ತಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಸ್ತಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ — ನಾನು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ನನಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರಿರ್.—ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾಳೆ ದಿವಸ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಗಮನ ಸೆಳೆಯುವ ಸೂಚನೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

SRI H.D. DEVEGOWDA —I want a categorical reply from the Government so far as this allegation is concerned. If they are not ready with the information today let them collect it and make it available to the House tomorrow, because it is a matter concerning Government property.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾಳೆ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಗಮನ ಸೆಳೆಯುವ ಸೂಚನೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್.ಡಿ. ದೇವೇಗೌಡ —ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾರು ಈ ಸದನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದೇ ಮನೆಯ ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಗುರುತರವಾದ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಇರುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಡಿನೈ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇದೆ. ಅವರ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕು ಗೊಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಪ್ರೌಢಶಾಲೆ ಕಟ್ಟಡ ಯಾವ ಪಶದಲ್ಲಿದೆ, ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಾಳೆ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಸದನಕ್ಕೆ ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು; ನಂತರ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತ ಪಡಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ದೇವೇಗೌಡರು ಯಾವ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕಟ್ಟಡದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನೀವೇಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ?

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—Sir, it has been revealed that a school building constructed by the Government for running a Government High School is being forcibly occupied by Sri Bheemanna Khandre's Education Society. It appears that they have not paid a naya paisa as rent for it and that the Government school is run in a rented building. This is the allegation I am making and it is upto the Hon'ble Member to accept it or deny it. I want the Hon'ble Chief Minister to find out from the Education Department and make a statement tomorrow whether my allegation that the Hon'ble Member Sri Bheemanna Khandre is having forcible occupation of the Government School building and is running his society High school there is correct or wrong. If it is correct, what is the rent Sri Bheemanna Khandre is paying and what action Government going to take in this matter?

SRI R. GUNDU RAO (Chief Minister).—Anyway, the matter has been brought to my notice. I will get it examined. I will get a report from the Education Department and try to present it tomorrow

## Presentation Of Report

SRI C M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, on behalf of the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, I present the Third Report of the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes on Reservation and Employment of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and other welfare measures taken for them in the Universities of Karnataka State.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Report is presented.